

Recept-154924

Council Hearing Date: 3-13-13
Council Hearing Time: 6:00 pm

APPEALS OF ACTIONS BY CITY OF RENO PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY OF RENO HEARING EXAMINER, OR BOARD OF APPEALS TO RENO CITY COUNCIL
(to be filed in Reno City Clerk's Office, 1 East First Street, Second Floor)

Re: Case No. LDC 13-00042

I. I certify I am, or represent, an aggrieved person who has a right to appeal.¹ The aggrieved person's rights, or his property rights, were adversely and substantially affected by a decision of the Planning Commission, Hearing Examiner, or Board of Appeals (as applicable, "Lower Body") as follows (continue explanation on back or attach pages, if necessary):

See attached.

02-19-13P12:14 RCVD

II. In accordance with Reno Municipal Code, Chapter 18.06, Article II, §18.06.208, I appeal the decision of the Lower Body.

III. I certify that the above reasons are based upon information presented at the underlying hearing held on the 6~~th~~ day of February, 20 13.

A. If the aggrieved person presents information to the Reno City Council ("Council") not previously presented at the underlying hearing, the Council may remand the matter to the Lower Body for additional hearings regarding the newly presented items.

B. Anyone, including the aggrieved person, may address the Council by written communication. Materials should be submitted to the City Manager's Office five working days prior to the Council hearing date set forth above. If information is untimely presented, Council may continue the hearing to a later date.

IV. I understand that the appeal fee is \$50, and the appeal will not be filed until the fee is paid. The appeal is non-refundable.

V. Signature of Aggrieved Person: [Signature]
or
Name of Aggrieved Person: _____
Signature of Representative: _____
Firm Name/Title: _____
Address: [Redacted]
Telephone: [Redacted]
Date: 2/18/13
Receipt No: _____

¹ An aggrieved person, which may be business entities and/or the City of Reno, is one whose personal right or right of property is adversely and substantially affected by the action of the Lower Body. Each aggrieved person must make his/her/its own appeal. Each appeal will be considered separately on its own merits.

February 17, 2013

TO: CITY OF RENO PLANNING COMMISSION
FR: JOE HANSEN, UNIVERSITY RIDGE HOME OWNER
RE: APPROVED INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

Dear Planning Commission,

I was out of town during your public hearing on February 6, 2013 when the Reno Planning Commission discussed the merits of locating an industrial composting dump, truck terminal and landscaping materials business on Gaslight Lane directly adjacent to the residential neighborhood in which I live (University Ridge).

It is my understanding that the Commissioners voted 6-1 in favor of this SUP and gave the green light to this industrial business (C4 Equity LLC, owned by Troy Carson).

Frankly, I was shocked that the Commission would display so little regard for the quality-of-life issues of a Reno residential community by agreeing to locate an industrial business in our backyard (literally) that will bring with it so many negative environmental impacts.

Setting aside the fact that it makes no sense to zone this parcel of property "industrial" when it is directly adjacent to a community of residential homes, we hope you will reconsider your Special Use Permit findings in lieu of the fact that a few of the findings are not factual.

We realize that you are busy people who don't have a lot of time to read impassioned pleas from impacted residents, so I will be brief and summarize the concerns of my neighbors, and the entire University Ridge Home Owner's Association, here:

1) Finding "F" on page 13 of your Staff Report dated February 6, 2013 states, "The project does not create adverse environmental impacts such as smoke, noise, glare, dust, vibrations, fumes, pollution or odor which would be detrimental to, or constitute a nuisance to area properties".

You've GOT to be kidding! How can your Commission conclude that the grinding of asphalt, the "beep beep beeping" of large trucks, wood chipping, and the continual loading and dumping of these raw materials will not cause a HUGE noise problem in this otherwise quiet neighborhood, to say nothing of dust and vibrations? Have you ever been on a construction site and heard concrete being loaded into these vehicles? The vibrations resonate for miles.

How can you claim that all of the planned composting will not create rotting odors that the frequent breezes up here will carry for miles?

2) Finding "D" on the same page of your Staff Report states, "The proposal adequately mitigates traffic impacts of the project...". In addition to the noise factor, how can the parade of loaders and trucks that a raw materials dump like this employs (to say nothing of customers who will dump here as well) not have significant traffic impacts in a neighborhood? This will be located at the very base and bottleneck of Socrates...the road that offers one viable way in and out for virtually all homeowners in University Ridge HOA. Putting this right next to an active railroad will also complicate congestion and safety matters.

Here's the bottom line – a large number of homes in these neighborhoods have views that look out over the city, mine included. This dump and compost business is not being located in the BACK of our community...it's being located in the FRONT, where it's in the line of sight for people who paid lot premiums to purchase homes with nice views of the city. This will surely have a negative impact on our home values (and, by extension, your property tax revenues). More importantly, it will have a very negative impact on the quality of life for hundreds of Reno residents who are about to be blind-sided by this business moving into their backyard.

I own a small business and frequently work in a home office. I can already hear the noise of the diesel engines starting very early in the morning, waking me and my neighbors from our sleep. I can imagine the sound of heavy machinery and trucks backing up breaking the peaceful quality of our neighborhood.

How can this kind of thing be part of any rational master plan in Reno? Are there not lots of other locations where this business could operate without impacting an established residential neighborhood?

Perhaps, according to the letter of the law, it is "legal" for a business of this nature to occupy a parcel of land that is zoned this way. But is it practical? Is it right for our community? As a drive through downtown Reno can attest, our city already suffers from any number of eyesores located adjacent to nice properties. Let's not keep making these same mistakes.

More to the point, your Commission needs to be forthright and honest about the environmental impact this business will have. I'm quite certain that, if this is allowed to move forward, the homeowners of our area (many of whom are lawyers) will find actionable grounds for filing lawsuits to address their grievances, given that the findings of your staff report conflict with the realities a business like this brings to bear on its surroundings. I doubt the owner and the city want to go through these expensive and lengthy processes. I know I don't. But, in standing up for the quality of life that Reno residents should expect in residential neighborhoods, I'm willing to join with my neighbors and seek justice.

We're not looking to make enemies of anyone or pick a fight. We're simply asking to have the same respect shown for our neighborhood's quality of life that each of you on the Commission wants in your own neighborhood.

There are much more logical locations for this planned business. We urge you to implore the property owner to seek these options out, and respectfully ask that you reconsider your approval of the SUP in question.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joe Hansen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Joe Hansen

University Ridge resident

